

<b>Office Action Summary</b> (For use in the First Action Interview Pilot Program)	<b>Application No.</b> 10/733,725	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KIM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID E. ENGLAND	<b>Art Unit</b> 2443	Page 1 of 3

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **ONE MONTH OR THIRTY (30) DAYS**, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

**This time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for only ONE additional MONTH. This communication constitutes notice under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(1)(i).**

☐ Applicant's request to not have a first-action interview is acknowledged.

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2009 and interview conducted on 10 March 2009.  
 2) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 3) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
     3a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 8) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 9) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 10) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 11) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Contact Information

Examiner's Telephone Number: (571)272-3912  
 Examiner's Typical Work Schedule: Mon-Thur, 7:30-5:30  
 Supervisor's Name: Tonia Dollinger  
 Supervisor's Telephone Number: 571-272-4170

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>03/10/2009</u> |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____   |

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10733725		<b>Applicant(s)</b> KIM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID E.. ENGLAND		<b>Art Unit</b> 2443	Page 2 of 3

**Notification of Rejection(s) and/or Objection(s)**

#	Claim(s)	Reference(s) (if applicable)	Rejection Statutory Basis	Brief Explanation of Rejection
1	3		112, 2nd	Claim 3 recites the limitation of "selected interval is about 100 milliseconds". This limitation is indefinite since there is no real limit, range or definite number, i.e.,...
2	18		112, 2nd	Claim 18 recites the limitation of "wherein said parameters". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. (cont')
3	1,6,8,9,15,17,18	A	102(a)	Claim 1 (col. 4, line 29-44); Claims 6 & 15 (col. 4, lines 17-65); Claims 8 & 17 (col. 4, lines 17-65); Claims 9 & 18 (col. 4, lines 17-65).
4	2,4,5,10,11,13,14,19,20	A,B	103(a)	2 (col. 1, line 39-col. 2, line 27 & col. 9, line 11-65 & col. 5, lines 1-43), 'A' doesn't teaches specific multi packet. 'B' discloses this, (col. 9, lines 54 et seq.). It would be obvious to only use a counter with...
5	3,12	A,B	103(a)	'A' teaches Claims 3 and 12 (col. 1, lines 52-67, timer is set so therefore it is up to the user to set the time to whatever they seem fit, i.e., 100 ms.).

**Expanded Discussion/Commentary**

1		... the term "about" make the claim indefinite.
2		It would appear that the Applicant wishes for claim 18 to depended from claim 17, not 10.
4		.. multiple packets because doing such would cut down on interrupt times since packets are processed in groups not individually. Claims 10,11,19 and 20 are rejected in the same light as claims 1 and 2. Claims 4,5,13,14 are similar in nature just stated differently. Both of which 'B' teaches, i.e., it will not process unless a couple of packes are counted for.

**DATE:**  
3/10/2009

/David E. England/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/733,725	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KIM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID E. ENGLAND	<b>Art Unit</b> 2443	Page 3 of 3

Notification of Rejection(s) and/or Objection(s)				
#	Claim(s)	Reference(s) (if applicable)	Rejection Statutory Basis	Brief Explanation of Rejection
6	7,16	A,B,C	103(a)	'A' and 'B' do not teach a namespace based on a selected sender. 'C' does (col. 5, line 14- col. 6, line 10). It would have been obvious to use namespaces since each packet network has a namespace...

Expanded Discussion/Commentary		
6		, a set of addresses that is recognized as sources for or destinations for packets. If a packet network receives a packet whose source or destination address is not part of the namespace of the network, the message is not forwarded. Therefore adding a level of security and blocking unrecognized nodes and/or users.
<b>DATE:</b> 3/10/2009		/David E. England/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443